

CHARITY BEGINS AT HOME — ORGANIZED CHARITY WORKS IT THAT WAY, SAYS REPORT

Right now, when organized charity is making such a fight to prevent the public giving to the needy any alms that do not go through the hands of the charity trust and the county has been compelled to set aside its custom of years of giving Thanksgiving baskets because of a deficit, the report of the Curran senatorial investigation committee, just issued, holds some interesting facts for the public to digest.

The United Charities and its affiliations have made a protest to Mayor Thompson against the plan of council that the city shall authorize a tag day for needy widows who are not getting charity help from the trust, and it has told the mayor that the mayor's own little bureau of public welfare shall have the say-so as to who may hold tag days. The head of this bureau, Mrs. Louise Osborne Rowe, is a splendid trailer of the organized charity heads. The one big thing achieved by the bureau since Mrs. Rowe got the \$5,000-a-year political plum was the woodpile plan turned down as "inhuman" by the previous administration.

The Curran committee made a two-year investigation of the charity trust, and during that time it got hold of the "nigger in the woodpile" in both the "personal service" department, for which the trust takes credit, and the fact that the charity trust turns over to the county an enormous number of its applicants instead of granting relief themselves.

Regarding the "personal service" bureau which is worked on the basis that the charity trust takes credit to itself for the money a man earns in a job which they get him, the report says:

"The United Charities furnished the committee with a little essay on 'An Estimate of the Cash Value of Personal Service of the United Charities.' It is stated therein that 'an at-

tempt to attach full cash value to the services rendered is far from easy, yet each bit of service rendered by such kind workers has a cash value.'"

The Curran report quotes from the statement of services rendered such as getting jobs and taking children to the country and the fact that the visitors—meaning paid employees of the trust—"received an average monthly wage of \$60, or \$28,000 for the year, and gave to the community, figuring the jobs at the amount the men got, etc., \$281,069.96."

"This statement is so absolutely ridiculous that it needs very little consideration," says the Curran report. "Getting employment for a man is a charitable occupation, yet in figuring out how much charity is devoted in that one endeavor, the total amount earned by everybody placed in the position is not the amount devoted to charity."

"We suppose that if the United Charities were in the business of furnishing employment to individuals and charging them therefor they would charge them the full amount they would receive from their position instead of merely a nominal consideration for obtaining positions, such as any employment agency does. If the United Charities can claim the value of the service rendered to be the total amount earned by these men, and at the same time these men will earn that amount, it is a new way of putting into circulation money that was never coined."

The committee further declares it doesn't get wise to how the U. C. credits itself with a dollar whenever they induce churches, relatives, friends, employers and benevolent individuals and other agencies to aid families. There are equally in the dark regarding the credit the U. C. takes unto itself for the medical aid given by doctors and nurses who